

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 28 2007

## REMARKS

**Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14 and 16 are Allowable**

The Office has rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, and 16, at paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,831,970 ("Awada") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,968,216 ("Chen") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,050,573 ("Okazaki"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Independent Claim 1

None of the cited references, including Awada, Chen, and Okazaki, disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, Awada, Chen, and Okazaki do not disclose a ringer controller that is adapted to automatically change a parameter of a ringer by matching a time and day of an incoming call to the ringer control schedule on a call-by-call basis, as recited in claim 1. In contrast to claim 1, Awada discloses changing the profile of a phone upon the occurrence of a particular event where the profile change continues for a specified period of time. (See Awada, col. 8, lines 11-46). Awada does not disclose a ringer controller that is adapted to automatically change a parameter of a ringer by matching a time and day of an incoming call to the ringer control schedule on a call-by-call basis, as recited in claim 1. Rather, Awada discloses that the parameter of the ringer has already been changed at a specified time for all calls received during the event. Further, Chen discloses modifying the ringer of a mobile device at a predetermined time where the ringer modification continues for a specified amount of time according to a ringer schedule. (See Chen, col. 5, lines 19-34 and col. 6, lines 20-41). Chen does not disclose or suggest a ringer controller that is adapted to automatically change a parameter of a ringer by matching a time and day of an incoming call to the ringer control schedule on a call-by-call basis, as recited in claim 1. Additionally, Okazaki discloses using a first set of ring tone data when a phone is set in a first mode of operation and using a second set of ring tone data when the phone is set in a second mode of operation. (See Okazaki, col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 16). Okazaki does not disclose or suggest a ringer controller that is adapted to automatically change a parameter of a ringer by matching a time and day of an incoming call to the ringer control schedule on a call-by-call basis, as recited in claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-4, 6, 7, and 10 depend from claim 1, which Applicant has shown to be allowable. Hence, Awada, Chen, and Okazaki fail to disclose at least one element of each of claims 2-4, 6, 7, and 10. Accordingly, claims 2-4, 6, 7, and 10 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Independent Claim 12

Further, none of the cited references, including Awada, Chen, and Okazaki, disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 12. Awada, Chen, and Okazaki do not disclose or suggest a ringer controller that is adapted to automatically change a parameter of a ringer by matching a time and day of an incoming call to the ringer control schedule on a call-by-call basis, as recited in claim 12. Hence, claim 12 is allowable.

Claim 14 depends from claim 12, which Applicant has shown to be allowable. Hence, Awada, Chen, and Okazaki fail to disclose at least one element of claim 14. Accordingly, claim 14 is also allowable, at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 12.

Independent Claim 16

Additionally, none of the cited references, including Awada, Chen, and Okazaki, disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 16. Awada, Chen, and Okazaki do not disclose or suggest a ringer controller that is adapted to automatically change a parameter of a ringer by matching a time and day of an incoming call to the ringer control schedule on a call-by-call basis, as recited in claim 16. Hence, claim 16 is allowable.

**Claims 5, 15, and 21 are Allowable**

The Office has rejected claims 5, 15, and 21, at paragraph 5 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Awada in view of Chen and further in view of Okazaki and U.S. Patent No. 6,763,105 ("Miura"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1, claim 15 depends from claim 12, and claim 21 depends from claim 16. Applicant has shown claims 1, 12, and 16 to be allowable. Miura does not disclose or suggest the elements of claims 1, 12, and 16 that are not disclosed or suggested by Awada, Chen, and Okazaki. In contrast, Miura discloses controlling a telephone to answer incoming calls according to a particular call answering setting (e.g. ring volume, ring pattern) or a particular call answering operation (e.g. ringer, vibration, voicemail) from a specified start time to a specified end time. (See Miura, col. 6, lines 55-65; col. 7, line 66 – col. 8, line 9; col. 11, lines 13-20). Miura does not disclose or suggest a ringer controller that is adapted to automatically change a parameter of a ringer by matching a time and day of an incoming call to the ringer control schedule on a call-by-call basis, as recited in claims 1, 12, and 16. Thus, claims 5, 15, and 21 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 1, 12, and 16, respectively.

**Claims 8, 9, 17, and 18 are Allowable**

The Office has rejected claims 8, 9, 17, and 18, at paragraph 6 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Awada in view of Chen and further in view of Okazaki and U.S. Patent No. 6,760,581 (“Dutta”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 1, and claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 16. Applicant has shown claims 1 and 16 to be allowable. Dutta does not disclose or suggest the elements of claims 1, 12, and 16 that are not disclosed or suggested by Awada, Chen, and Okazaki. In contrast, Dutta discloses implementing an automatic hold feature on a phone for a certain amount of time, as long as the phone is receiving Bluetooth commands triggering the automatic hold feature. (See Dutta, col. 5, line 51 – col. 6, line 13). Dutta does not disclose or suggest a ringer controller that is adapted to automatically change a parameter of a ringer by matching a time and day of an incoming call to the ringer control schedule on a call-by-call basis, as recited in claims 1 and 16. Thus, claims 8, 9, 17, and 18 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 1 and 16, respectively.

**Claims 22, 24, and 25 are Allowable**

The Office has rejected claims 22, 24, and 25, at paragraph 7 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Awada in view of Chen and further in view of Dutta. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

None of the cited references, including Awada, Chen, and Dutta, disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 22. As mentioned previously, Awada, Chen, and Dutta do not disclose or suggest a ringer controller that is adapted to automatically change a parameter of a ringer by matching a time and day of an incoming call to the ringer control schedule on a call-by-call basis, as recited in claim 22. Hence, claim 22 is allowable.

Claim 25 depends from claim 22, which Applicant has shown to be allowable. Hence, Awada, Chen, and Dutta fail to disclose at least one element of claim 25. Accordingly, claim 25 is also allowable, at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 22.

**Claim 23 is Allowable**

The Office has rejected claim 23, at paragraph 8 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Awada in view of Chen and further in view of Dutta and Okazaki. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 23 depends from claim 22, which Applicant has shown to be allowable. As mentioned previously, Awada, Chen, Dutta, and Okazaki do not disclose or suggest a ringer controller that is adapted to automatically change a parameter of a ringer by matching a time and day of an incoming call to the ringer control schedule on a call-by-call basis, as recited in claim 22. Hence, Awada, Chen, Dutta, and Okazaki fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 23. Accordingly, claim 23 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 22.

Attorney Docket No.: 1033-MS1013

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 28 2007

CONCLUSION

Applicant has pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.


Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

3-28-2007  
Date

  
Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TOLER SCHAFFER, L.L.P.  
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(512) 327-5515 (phone)  
(512) 327-5575 (fax)